

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended.

Claims 1 - 15 are present and pending in the subject application.

In the Office Action dated June 26, 2008, the Examiner has rejected claims 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101, has rejected claims 1 - 3, 6 - 8 and 11 - 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and has rejected claims 4 - 5, 9 - 10 and 14 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Favorable reconsideration of the subject application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

The Examiner has rejected claims 11 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Examiner takes the position that the claims recite a “computer network system” comprising only software elements and, thus, is a program per se. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. In particular, the Examiner indicates that the claims recite a “computer network system”. This type of system is not software per se, but rather, an apparatus that is clearly within the statutory subject matter of 35 U.S.C. §101. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the subject application, independent claim 11 has been amended for further clarification and recites the feature of a computer system. Accordingly, independent claim 11 and its corresponding dependent claims are considered to comply with 35 U.S.C. §101.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 - 3, 6 - 8 and 11 - 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,091,930 (Mortimer et al.). Further, the Examiner has rejected claims 4 - 5, 9 - 10 and 14 - 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Mortimer et al. patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,606,633 (Tabuchi).

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the courtesies extended by Examiner Bashore and Examiner Nguyen during the Interview of April 1, 2008. During the Interview, the Examiner indicated that placement of the list features in the claim body and further clarification of the addition or removal of the prerequisite content entities as automatic and without user intervention may overcome the rejections, but further consideration would be needed.

In the prior amendment, independent claims 1, 6 and 11 were amended in accordance with the Interview to place the list features in the claim body, further clarify aspects of the claimed invention, and recite the features of automatically adding or removing the designated prerequisite content entities to or from the list in direct response to user interaction initiating the addition or removal of the selected content entity.

The Examiner has maintained the rejections in response to that amendment. These rejections are respectfully traversed. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the subject application, independent claims 1, 6 and 11 have been amended to further clarify the automatic insertion or removal of the prerequisite content entities and recite the features of automatically adding or removing the designated prerequisite content entities to or from the list without further user intervention beyond initiating the addition or removal of the selected content entity to add or remove the prerequisite content entities to or from the content object in addition to the addition or removal of the selected content entity.

The Examiner takes the position that the Mortimer et al. patent discloses the features of automatic addition or removal of the prerequisite content entities based on teachings of a plurality of secondary link sequences to connect data, and dynamically changing a presentation

sequence based upon student activation of a selected one of the plurality of secondary link sequences (e.g., See Column 14, lines 23 - 24; and Claim 16).

However, the Mortimer et al. patent expressly discloses that the secondary links are passive links **that are not automatically executed during a presentation.** Rather, the secondary links are activated by a student during a presentation (e.g., See Column 14, lines 26 - 35 and Claim 16). Thus, the Mortimer et al. patent does not disclose, teach or suggest automatically adding or removing the designated prerequisite content entities to or from the list without further user intervention beyond initiating the addition or removal of the selected content entity as recited in the independent claims. In other words, the claims recite that once addition or removal of the selected content entity has been initiated by the user, the addition or removal of the prerequisite content entities is automatically performed (without any further user interaction specifying addition or removal of prerequisite content entities).

Since the Mortimer et al. patent does not disclose, teach or suggest the features recited in independent claims 1, 6 and 11 as discussed above, these claims are considered to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 2 - 3, 7 - 8 and 12 - 13 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 6 or 11 and, therefore, include all the limitations of their parent claims. These claims are considered to be in condition for allowance for substantially the same reasons discussed above in relation to their parent claims and for further limitations recited in the claims.

With respect to the rejection of claims 4 - 5, 9 - 10, and 14 - 15 under 35 U.S.C §103(a), these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1, 6 or 11 and,

**AMENDMENT**  
**Appln. No.: 09/488,969**


**Attorney Docket No.: STL000017US1 (0920.0040C)**

therefore, include all the limitations of their parent claims. As discussed above, the Mortimer et al. patent does not disclose, teach or suggest the features within parent claims 1, 6 or 11. The Tabuchi patent does not compensate for the deficiencies of the Mortimer et al. patent. Rather, the Tabuchi patent discloses a compound document management system and is merely utilized by the Examiner for an alleged teaching of reduction of a rule set and rewriting of rules.

Since the Mortimer et al. and Tabuchi patents do not disclose, teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, the features recited in claims 4 - 5, 9 - 10, and 14 - 15 as discussed above, these claims are considered to be in condition for allowance.

The application, having been shown to overcome issues raised in the Office Action, is considered to be in condition for allowance and Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Stuart B. Shapiro  
Reg. No. 40,169

EDELL, SHAPIRO & FINNAN, LLC  
1901 Research Blvd., Suite 400  
Rockville, Maryland 20850-3164  
(301) 424-3640

Delivered on: 08/04/08